1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 6 7 PHILADELPHIA INDEMNITY INSURANCE COMPANY, 8 Plaintiff(s), Case No. 2:16-cv-00464-JAD-NJK 9 ORDER DENYING STIPULATION VS. 10 FOR EXTENSION OF TIME LUXURY SUITES INTERNATIONAL, LLC, 11 (Docket No. 7) Defendant(s). 12 13 Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend time for Defendant to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. Docket No. 7. A stipulation to extend time made after the expiration of the deadline will 14 15 not be granted unless the parties demonstrate that the failure to file the request before the deadline expired was the result of excusable neglect. LR IA 6-1(a). 16 17 Here, the parties filed their stipulation on July 18, 2016, seeking to extend the deadline for Defendant to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint, which expired on June 3, 2016. Docket No. 7; see also 18 19 Docket No. 6. Thus, the Local Rules require them to demonstrate excusable neglect, which the parties 20 fail to address, much less establish. See Docket No. 7 at 1-2. Accordingly, the parties' stipulation, 21 Docket No. 7, is **DENIED** without prejudice. 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 DATED: July 19, 2016 24 NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge 25 26 27 28